FILE COPY.

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1905.

No. 61.

Office Supreme Court U. S.
FILED
MAR 10 1906
JAMES H. MCKENNEY,
Clerk

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK UPON THE RELATION OF THE NEW YORK CENTRAL AND HUDSON RIVER RAILROAD COMPANY,

Plaintiffs in Error.


vs.

NATHAN L. MILLER, AS COMPTROLLER OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK,

Defendant.

IN ERROR TO THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK.

MOTION.



Come now The People of the State of New York upon the relation of The New York Central and Hudson River Railroad Company, Plaintiffs in Error, and move the Supreme Court of the United States that case No. 81 of this Term be put back upon the call.

12th of March, 1906.

SIR:

On the 12th of March, 1906, or as soon thereafter as counsel can in that behalf be heard, we will move the Supreme Court of the United States that the above and foregoing rule be granted.

Yours very truly,

IRA A. PLACE.
THOMAS EMERY.

To JULIUS M. MAYER,
Attorney General,
Attorney for Defendant.

For and on behalf of the defendant, Comptroller of the State of New York, I hereby join and unite in the request that the rule to be moved for as above be granted.

March the 12th, 1906.

JULIUS M. MAYER,
Attorney General,
Attorney for Defendant.

FILE COPY.

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1905.

No. 82.

Office Supreme Court U. S.
FILED
MAR 10 1906
JAMES H. MCKENNEY,

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK UPON THE RELATION OF THE NEW YORK CENTRAL AND HUDSON RIVER RAILROAD COMPANY,

Plaintiffs in Error,


vs.

NATHAN L. MILLER, AS COMPTROLLER OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK,

Defendant.

IN ERROR TO THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK.

MOTION.



Come now The People of the State of New York upon the relation of The New York Central and Hudson River Railroad Company, Plaintiffs in Error, and move the Supreme Court of the United States that case No. 82 of this Term be put back upon the call and set down for hearing with case No. 81 of this Term.

These cases involve the question of the validity of so much of a franchise tax, imposed by defendant against relator under authority of Article IX. of the Tax Law of the State of New York, as is computed upon such amount of relator's capital stock as is invested in and represented by the average amount of relator's rolling stock which was continuously throughout the tax year situate and employed outside of the State of New York.

Case No. 81 has relation to the tax for the year 1900 and case No. 82 has relation to the tax for the year 1901, and both thereof involve the same questions.

12th of March, 1906.

SIR:

On the 12th of March, 1906, or as soon thereafter as counsel can in that behalf be heard, we will move the Supreme Court of the United States that the above and foregoing rule be granted.

Yours very truly,

IRA A. PLACE.
THOMAS EMERY.

To JULIUS M. MAYER,
Attorney General,
Attorney for Defendant.

For and on behalf of the defendant, Comptroller of the State of New York, I hereby join and unite in the request that the rule to be moved for as above be granted.

March the 12th, 1906.

JULIUS M. MAYER,
Attorney General,
Attorney for Defendant.

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1905.

No. 295.

Office Supreme Court U. S.
FILED
MAR 10 1906
JAMES H. McKENNEY, Clerk.

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK UPON THE RELATION OF THE NEW YORK CENTRAL AND HUDSON RIVER RAILROAD COMPANY,

Plaintiffs in Error,


vs.

OTTO KELSEY, AS COMPTROLLER OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK,

Defendant.

IN ERROR TO THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK.

MOTION.



Come now The People of the State of New York upon the relation of The New York Central and Hudson River Railroad Company, Plaintiffs in Error, and move the Supreme Court of the United States that case No. 586 of this Term be advanced and set down for hearing with case No. 81 of this Term.

These cases involve the question of the validity of so much of a franchise tax, imposed by defendant against relator under authority of Article IX. of the Tax Law of the State of New York, as is computed upon such amount of relator's capital stock as is invested in and represented by the average amount of relator's rolling stock which was continuously throughout the tax year situate and employed outside of the State of New York.

Case No. 81 has relation to the tax for the year 1900 and case No. 586 has relation to the tax for the year 1902. The validity of the tax for the year 1902 is questioned on the same grounds as, and upon others than those set up in relation to the tax for the year 1900.

12th of March, 1906.

SIR:

On the 12th of March, 1906, or as soon thereafter as counsel can in that behalf be heard, we will move the Supreme Court of the United States that the above and foregoing rule be granted.

Yours very truly,

IRA A. PLACE.
THOMAS EMERY.

To JULIUS M. MAYER,
Attorney General,
Attorney for Defendant.

For and on behalf of the defendant, Comptroller of the State of New York, I hereby join and unite in the request that the rule to be moved for as above be granted.

March the 12th, 1906.

JULIUS M. MAYER,
Attorney General,
Attorney for Defendant.

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1905.

No. 697.

Supreme Court U. S.
FILED
MAR 10 1906

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK UPON THE RELATION OF THE NEW YORK CENTRAL AND HUDSON RIVER RAILROAD COMPANY,

Plaintiffs in Error,

vs.

OTTO KELSEY, AS COMPTROLLER OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK,

Defendant.

IN ERROR TO THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK.

MOTION.

Come now The People of the State of New York upon the relation of The New York Central and Hudson River Railroad Company, Plaintiffs in Error, and move the Supreme Court of the United States that case No. 587 of this Term be advanced and set down for hearing with case No. 81 of this Term.

These cases involve the question of the validity of so much of a franchise tax, imposed by defendant against relator under authority of Article IX. of the Tax Law of the State of New York, as is computed upon such amount of relator's capital stock as is invested in and represented by the average amount of relator's rolling stock which was continuously throughout the tax year situate and employed outside of the State of New York.

Case No. 81 has relation to the tax for the year 1900 and case No. 587 has relation to the tax for the year 1903. The validity of the tax for the year 1903 is questioned on the same grounds as, and upon others than those set up in relation to the tax for the year 1900.

12th of March, 1906.

SIR:

On the 12th of March, 1906, or as soon thereafter as counsel can in that behalf be heard, we will move the Supreme Court of the United States that the above and foregoing rule be granted.

Yours very truly,

IRA A. PLACE.
THOMAS EMERY.

To JULIUS M. MAYER,
Attorney General,
Attorney for Defendant.

For and on behalf of the defendant, Comptroller of the State of New York, I hereby join and unite in the request that the rule to be moved for as above be granted.

March the 12th, 1906.

JULIUS M. MAYER,
Attorney General,
Attorney for Defendant.

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1905.

No. 880.

Office Supreme Court U. S.
FILED
MAR 10 1906
JAMES H. MCKENNEY,
Clerk.

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK UPON THE RELATION OF THE NEW YORK CENTRAL AND HUDSON RIVER RAILROAD COMPANY,

Plaintiffs in Error,

vs.

OTTO KELSEY, AS COMPTROLLER OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK,

Defendant.

IN ERROR TO THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK.

MOTION.

Come now The People of the State of New York upon the relation of The New York Central and Hudson River Railroad Company, Plaintiffs in Error, and move the Supreme Court of the United States that case No. 588 of this Term be advanced and set down for hearing with case No. 81 of this Term.

These cases involve the question of the validity of so much of a franchise tax, imposed by defendant against relator under authority of Article IX. of the Tax Law of the State of New York, as is computed upon such amount of relator's capital stock as is invested in and represented by the average amount of relator's rolling stock which was continuously throughout the tax year situate and employed outside of the State of New York.

Case No. 81 has relation to the tax for the year 1900 and case No. 588 has relation to the tax for the year 1904. The validity of the tax for the year 1904 is questioned on the same grounds as, and upon others than those set up in relation to the tax for the year 1900.

12th of March, 1906.

SIR:

On the 12th of March, 1906, or as soon thereafter as counsel can in that behalf be heard, we will move the Supreme Court of the United States that the above and foregoing rule be granted.

Yours very truly,

IRA A. PLACE.
THOMAS EMERY.

To JULIUS M. MAYER,
Attorney General,
Attorney for Defendant.

For and on behalf of the defendant, Comptroller of the State of New York, I hereby join and unite in the request that the rule to be moved for as above be granted.

March the 12th, 1906.

JULIUS M. MAYER,
Attorney General,
Attorney for Defendant.